

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC. IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT 3576 UNOCAL PLACE SANTA ROSA CA 95403

## **COPY MAILED**

AUG 0 8 2005

## OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :

Victor I. Chomensky

Application No. 10/010,911 : DECISION ON PETITION

Filed: 20 November, 2001 :

Atty Docket No. P775 CON 3

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed on 13 June, 2005 (certificate of mailing date 13 July, 2004), under 37 CFR  $1.137\,(b)$ , to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b)  $\underline{\text{must}}$  be accompanied by:

<sup>(1)</sup> the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

<sup>(2)</sup> the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

<sup>(3)</sup> a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

<sup>(4)</sup> any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

The application became abandoned on 5 December, 2003, for failure to timely file a response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on 4 November, 2003, which set a one (1) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 14 June, 2004. The petition filed on 10 May, 2005 (certificate of mailing date 13 July, 2004), was dismissed on 6 June, 2005.

The address listed on the petition is different than the correspondence address of record. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application will be mailed solely to the address of record.

The application is being referred to Technology Center 3739 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.

Douglas I. Wood Senior Petitions Attorney Office of Petitions

CC: VINCENT B. INGRASSIA
INGRASSIA, FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.
7150 CAMELBACK ROAD, SUITE 325
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251